

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The Office Action dated March 31, 2010 has been received and its contents carefully considered. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration of this application. Applicant amends claim 1 to include the subject matter of claims 5 and 6. Accordingly, claims 5 and 6 are herewith cancelled. Claim 2 remains cancelled. Claims 1 and 3, 4, and 7-14 are currently pending in this application. Based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A)

On page 2, the Office Action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (U.S. Patent No. 5,403,240) in view of Buchholz (U.S. Patent No. 5,797,180). On page 3, claims 3-9, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Buchholz and further in view of European document EP 1227267 to Morone. Based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits the claims are patentable over the above cited references.

A. CLAIM 1

As indicated by the Action, the combination of Smith in view of Buchholz does not disclose or render obvious the subject matter of original claims 5 and 6. The Action turns to Morone to remedy the deficiencies of Smith and Buchholz and uses the combination of Smith, Buchholz, and Morone to reject claims 3-9, 13, and 14. Claim 1

now incorporates the subject matter of claims 5 and 6. Due to the incorporation of the subject matter of claims 5 and 6, Applicant treats the rejections to claims 5 and 6 as if they applied to newly amended claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Morone and Buchholz fail to remedy the deficiencies of Smith for at least the following reasons.

First, Smith describes a cam for axially shifting the pulley faces of a variable width pulley. As provided in the Action, Smith “lacks a plastic single tubular body that is co-moulded with said shaft” (Action, page 3). Applicant respectfully agrees. Applicant further points out that the claimed singular tubular body not only includes the first cam that is rigidly connected to the fixed-half pulley, but also includes the bushing on which the mobile half-pulley is slidably fitted. In other words, the claimed bushing, which is part of the tubular body rigidly connected to the fixed-half pulley via the first cam, is axially fixed.

The Action further provides that Buchholz purportedly teaches “the cam is defined by a singular tubular body made of plastic material co-moulded on said supporting shaft” (Action page 3). While Applicant does not agree that the teachings of Buchholz are applicable to Smith, it is incontrovertible that neither reference, either individually or in combination teaches a single body made of plastic and co-moulded on a supporting shaft forms **both** the first cam and a supporting bushing for the mobile half-pulley as now recited in amended claim 1. In fact the Action recognizes this by the further reliance on Morone in the rejection of prior claims 5 and 6 now incorporated into claim 1.

Referring more specifically to Buchholz, this document discloses a method of manufacturing a plastic camshaft with a tubular metal. In Buchholz, a composite camshaft 20 is formed by a tubular metal insert 22 and an outer plastic portion 24 (Buchholz, col. 2, lines 61-65). The tubular metal insert is secured within a die assembly 40 which forms a mold cavity 62 (Buchholz, col. 3, lines 53-67). Plastic is injected into the mold cavity 62 and the plastic surrounds the metal insert to form the camshaft 20. As disclosed, Buchholz seeks to create a composite camshaft that avoids a “flash” problem of camshafts with a metal insert core (See Buchholz, col. 1, lines 20-39). Applicant respectfully submits that the issues addressed in Buchholz have nothing to do with the invention as described in Smith and a person of ordinary skill in the art would have no reason whatsoever to turn to Buchholz to modify Smith. Further, Buchholz neither discloses nor intimates utilizing the arrangement disclosed therein for any function other than a camshaft. In contrast, amended claim 1 recites a pulley for a variable transmission which includes a singular plastic body co-moulded onto a supporting shaft and which includes both the first cam and a “supporting bushing” on which the mobile half-pulley is slidably fitted. Neither Buchholz or Smith teach this feature as discussed above.

Second, the Action turns to Morone, in combination with Smith and Buchholz, to teach “said mobile half-pulley (202) is slidably fitted on a support bushing (300) made of plastic material” (Action page 4). Applicant respectfully submits that Morone is misconstrued and fails to remedy the deficiencies of Smith and Buchholz.

Morone discloses an expandable pulley which seeks to improve the wear resistance of parts of a pulley (See Morone paragraph [0006]). In fact, Applicant discusses Morone in page 2, beginning at line 17 of the instant application as filed and

explains the differences between the claimed invention and Morone (See Preliminary Amendment). The present Application indicates that the Morone “driven pulley includes a device for compensating axial thrust consisting of **individual cams** overmoulded on a support disc that is part of the clutch and is rigidly connected to the fixed pulley.” Further, the present application explains that the Morone “driven pulley is relatively complex, has a high number of pieces and entails high manufacturing costs” which is in contrast to the claimed invention. By contrast, the claimed arrangement results in a particularly simple and cost-effective pulley, with a limited number of pieces. Moreover, Applicant disagrees that Morone “teaches said mobile half-pulley (202) is slidably fitted on a supporting bushing (300)...” as contended in the Action.

That is, Morone’s element 300 “slides on the sleeve 2a, following the half-pulley 202” (Morone, paragraph [00044]). By contrast, amended claim 1 recites a tubular body that includes the first cam and a “**supporting bushing on which** said mobile half-pulley is **slidably fitted.**” Because none of the documents relied upon in this rejection teach this feature, Applicant respectfully submits that no reasonable combination of Smith, Buchholz, and Morone could possibly render obvious the claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing remarks.

B. CLAIMS 3, 4, AND 7-14

Claims 3, 4, and 7-14 depend from amended claim 1 and overcome the §103(a) rejections for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing remarks.

III. CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Dated: August 30, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Robert Kinberg/
Robert Kinberg
Registration No.: 26,924
Justine A. Gozzi
Registration No.: 60,513
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, DC 20043-9998
(202) 344-4000
(202) 344-8300 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant

RK:JAG/elw

::ODMA\PCDOCS\DC2DOCS\1\1126066\7